

The Philippine-American War: A Model for Declaring Victory in Iraq

**A Monograph
by
MAJ Crayton Simmons
United States Army**



**School of Advanced Military Studies
United States Army Command and General Staff College
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas**

AY 2011

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				<i>Form Approved</i> OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 03-31-2011		2. REPORT TYPE SAMS Monograph		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) JUN 2010 – MAY 2011	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Philippine-American War: A Model for Declaring Victory in Iraq				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Major Crayton Simmons				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) School of Advanced Military Studies (SAMS) 250 Gibbon Avenue Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2134				8. PERFORMING ORG REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT: Even though Operations Iraqi and Enduring Freedom have created a surging trend of research and literature connected with irregular warfare, there is still inadequate study and appreciation of the United States commitment in the Philippines at the beginning of the twentieth century. Despite a rapid Spanish defeat in the Philippine theater during the 1898 Spanish-American War, America would fight a difficult and complex insurgency in the islands until 1902, and beyond. The decisions and actions of key American civilian and military leaders throughout the Philippine-American War provide valuable insight to defining victory in the current and future irregular wars that America must fight. This monograph identifies and examines three key objectives, whose achievement laid the foundation for America's claim to victory during the Philippine-American War. Additionally, by relating these objectives to the 2003 war in Iraq, this monograph proposes that America has a historically supported claim to victory in the Iraq War.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Military History, Irregular Warfare					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF: UNCLASSIFIED			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT (U)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 46	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Wayne Grigsby COL, US Army
a. REPORT (U)	b. ABSTRACT (U)	c. THIS PAGE (U)			19b. PHONE NUMBER (include area code) 913-758-3302

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39.18

SCHOOL OF ADVANCED MILITARY STUDIES

MONOGRAPH APPROVAL

MAJ Crayton Simmons

Title of Monograph: The Philippine-American War: A Model for Declaring Victory in Iraq
Approved by:

Thomas A. Bruscino, PhD

Monograph Director

Myron J. Reineke, COL, IN

Second Reader

Wayne Grigsby, COL, IN

Director,
School of Advanced
Military Studies

Robert F. Baumann, Ph.D.

Director,
Graduate Degree
Programs

Disclaimer: Opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed or implied within are solely those of the author, and do not represent the views of the US Army School of Advanced Military Studies, the US Army Command and General Staff College, the United States Army, the Department of Defense, or any other US government agency. Cleared for public release: distribution unlimited.

Abstract

THE PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN WAR: A MODEL FOR DECLARING VICTORY IN IRAQ by MAJ Crayton Simmons, United States Army, 46 pages.

Even though Operations Iraqi and Enduring Freedom have created a surging trend of research and literature connected with irregular warfare, there is still inadequate study and appreciation of the United States commitment in the Philippines at the beginning of the twentieth century. Despite a rapid Spanish defeat in the Philippine theater during the 1898 Spanish-American War, America would fight a difficult and complex insurgency in the islands until 1902, and beyond. The decisions and actions of key American civilian and military leaders throughout the Philippine-American War provide valuable insight to defining victory in the current and future irregular wars that America must fight. This monograph identifies and examines three key objectives, whose achievement laid the foundation for America's claim to victory during the Philippine-American War. Additionally, by relating these objectives to the 2003 war in Iraq, this monograph proposes that America has a historically supported claim to victory in the Iraq War.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Setting the Stage for the Philippine-American War.....	4
Capturing the Philippine Kings.....	9
Civilian Government in the Philippines.....	13
Reconciliation in the Philippine-American War.....	20
Resolving Matters in the Philippine-American War.....	25
Setting the Stage for the War in Iraq.....	26
Capturing the Iraqi Kings.....	29
Civilian Government in Iraq.....	34
Reconciliation in the Iraq War.....	36
Resolving Matters in Iraq.....	38
Conclusion.....	39
Bibliography.....	41

Introduction

On Monday, May 7, 1945, in Reims, France, German General Alfred Johl signed papers ending what newscaster Henry Gladstone called “the greatest war in history.” American, British, and Russian representatives accepted the unconditional surrender of German forces and fighting in the European Theater of World War II effectively ended.¹ A similar scene unfolded in the sands of Safwan, Iraq on Sunday, March 3, 1991 as General Norman Schwarzkopf sat across an armistice table from Lieutenant General Sultan Hashim Ahmad and dictated the future of the defeated Iraqi forces.² Victory becomes more complicated however when there is no surrendering country—or army to surrender for it. Moreover, tactical victories, as Vietnam clearly demonstrates, do not always translate into a win in the eyes of the American public.

There is a dictionary definition for victory, but everyone has their own nuanced idea about what a win is and what it feels like to come out on top. There is only one Super Bowl Champion at the end of the football season and only one leading automobile sales manufacturer at the end of the fiscal year. Nonetheless, sometimes defining a clear leader and a champion is difficult. An academic inquiry of victory and defeat becomes more complicated when considering less than perfect completion of a task or perhaps, only partial achievement of one’s stated goals. In fact, under increasing pressure to produce results, many military professionals and government officials have begun to speak in terms of “success” in Iraq and Afghanistan as opposed to using the term “victory” or the phrase “win the war.” As J. Boone Bartholomees succinctly states in *Theory of Victory*, “The concept of victory is the biggest theoretical challenge facing security professionals today.”³

Current military doctrine suggests that military end state linked to national strategy and objectives, and accomplished through battle command in support of mission command is the goal of

¹ *Germany's Surrender in WWII and Related Media*. <http://www.history.com/audio/germanys-surrender-in-wwii#germanys-surrender-in-wwii> (accessed October 26, 2010).

² Rick Atkinson, *Crusade: The Untold Story of the Persian Gulf War* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1993), 1-10.

³ J. Boone Bartholomees, "Theory of Victory," *Parameters*, 38 (Summer 2008), 25-36.

military forces. But does this lead to victory? And is this concept valid in irregular warfare environments? The June 2001 edition of Field Manual 3-0, *Operations*, states, “The Army organizes, trains, and equips its forces to fight and win the nation’s wars and achieve directed national objectives. Fighting and winning the nation’s wars is the foundation of Army service—the Army’s non-negotiable contract with the American people and its enduring obligation to the nation.”⁴

In the foreword to the February 2008 edition of United States Army Field Manual 3-0, *Operations*, General William S. Wallace states that “...final victory requires concurrent stability operations to lay the foundation for lasting peace.” Additionally, the field manual specifies that the “Operational art encompasses visualizing the synchronized arrangement and employment of military forces and capabilities to achieve the strategic or operational end state. This creative process requires the ability to discern the conditions required for victory before committing forces to action.”⁵ So victory in this sense is both an achievement of the strategic or operational end state and a lasting peace.

Current doctrine is a good guidepost for shaping our understanding of victory but superimposing the doctrinal concepts on complex multi-faceted conflicts leaves something out. Accounting for statistics and battles won can provide us critical details and specific points of data, but without the supporting holistic context, a war narrative seems incomplete. History proves that victory is both metrics and perception.

Fred Ikle, author of *Every War Must End*, reinforced the idea of having a clear strategy prior to waging war—a theme that is also present in our current military doctrine. Even more importantly however is the insightful linkage between ending a war and future impact, or as Ikle states: “The battles fought during a war, of course, contribute to its aftermath; but it is the way in which a war is brought to an end that has the most decisive long-term impact.”⁶

⁴ *FM 3-0 Operations* (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2001), 1-2.

⁵ *FM 3-0 Operations* (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2008), 6-5.

⁶ Fred Charles Ikle, *Every War Must End* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), xvii.

In June 2010, at the War Termination Conference at the United States Military Academy at West Point, Dr. Roger Spiller discussed the traditional notion of victory as a limiting factor which obscures the complexity of modern warfare. More importantly, he suggested that victory cannot necessarily be pinpointed as a single occurrence. Spiller said, "In closer examination, if you look at how wars actually finish and the nature of the peace that follows, you find that victory is not really an event. I mean, the end of war is not really an event like victory, I should say, and that its effects can reverberate for years."⁷

Everett Carl Dolman, in *Pure Strategy: Power and Principle in the Space and Information Age*, provided additional perspective on the relationship of the victor and the vanquished in war. Dolman recounted that late Vermont senator George Aiken proposed in 1966 that America declare victory in Vietnam and withdraw its troops, asserting that the only ones who could have challenged that claim were the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese. Considering a quote by Richard Hart Sinnreich who said, "It's not the winner who typically decides when victory in a war has been achieved. It's the loser," Dolman concluded, "Tactical victory is absolutely determined by the submission of the defeated, but it can also be proclaimed based on achievement of conditional and relative goals."⁸

The results of the Philippine-American War suggest that twenty-first century armies that are fighting small wars can proclaim victory based on the achievement of three strategic objectives. First, they must isolate or incorporate the modern-day monarch, leader, symbol, or head of the resisting army or guerilla force. Second, a legitimate civilian government has to be emplaced in order to govern the country and represent the country in the international community. And third, some sort of reconciliation between the opposing forces has to occur. Individually, these events or efforts may not produce the effects necessary to declare victory with any sense of validity, but when combined, the achievement of these objectives provide a powerful argument that an army has won the war. America can proclaim victory in

⁷ Matthew Moten, "Interview - Dr. Roger Spiller," *War Termination* (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2010), 23.

⁸ Everett C. Dolman, *Pure Strategy: Power and Principle in the Space and Information Age* (New York: Frank Cass, 2005), 7-8.

Iraq based on the achievement of strategic objectives that are compatible and comparable with victory in another counterinsurgency—the Philippine-American War.

This monograph uses the Philippine-American War as a historical case study in order to explore the three major factors that allowed America to declare victory in 1902. Additionally, this monograph applies the factors which were critical to the victory declaration in the Philippine-American War to the 2003 war in Iraq in order to determine if the United States can claim victory in the conflict. This monograph is divided into two major sections; the first section is a study on the Philippine-American War and the second major section is a review of the war in Iraq. The first part of both major sections of this monograph outlines the historical context and background of America's entry into the conflicts and includes an examination of the political objectives in each war. Three subsections within both major sections of the monograph detail the impact of America's hunt for some key guerilla leaders, the establishment of a civilian government, and reconciliation efforts and their effect on fighting in the Philippines and Iraq. In the concluding section, this monograph assesses the case for declaring victory in Iraq and what the long-term implications of the achievement of the major factors identified may be for Iraq and, if applicable, Afghanistan.

Setting the Stage for the Philippine-American War

In 1898, the Spanish-American War initiated conflict in the Philippines and despite a rapid Spanish defeat and American control of the Philippine capital city of Manila, the United States would fight a difficult and complex insurgency in the islands until 1902, and beyond. The decisions and actions of key American civilian and military leaders throughout the Philippine-American War provide valuable insight to defining victory in the current and future irregular wars that the United States must fight. Expansionist Theodore Roosevelt, serving as Governor of New York and already famous for his actions at the Battle of San Juan Hill, stated on April 10, 1899, in a speech before the Hamilton Club of Chicago that, "We cannot avoid the responsibilities that confront us in Hawaii, Cuba, Porto Rico, and the

Philippines.”⁹ Americans began fighting the Spanish in the Philippines in 1898 with “Remember the Maine!” deeply rooted in soldier and civilian memory alike. But the rapid Spanish defeat only heralded the fighting that would commence in 1899 as the Philippine-American War, formerly known as the Philippine Insurrection, began.¹⁰

It is doubtful that in 1902, when President Theodore Roosevelt declared victory, that the Philippines turned out the way America envisioned in 1898. There were undoubtedly shifting strategic objectives brought about by the realities of fighting on the ground and domestic pressure in the United States. Americans are winners, however, and anything short of victory in the Philippines was unacceptable. The American president had to be able to declare victory at the conclusion of the war. But in truth, the disposition of the Philippines and employment of American troops was unclear from the start.

Most of the correspondence pertaining to unit alerts and preparations for troop deployments to the Philippines refer to a very generic Philippine “expedition.” The War Department appointed Major General Wesley Merritt to command the Philippine expedition and official records document that he met personally with wartime President William McKinley on May 12, 1898. On May 13, 1898, Major General Merritt provided an estimate of the number and types of troops necessary “to constitute an expedition to the Philippines with a fair chance of success after arriving there.”¹¹ Even after meeting with President McKinley however, the expeditionary commander seemed unclear about what exactly his force was supposed to do upon arrival in the Philippines. One may assume that he was verbally given instructions by the President when they met face-to-face, but that does not appear to be accurate when on May 15, 1898, Major General Merritt’s correspondence to President McKinley states that: “I do not yet know whether it is your desire to subdue and hold all of the Spanish territory in the islands, or merely to seize

⁹ Theodore Roosevelt, *The Strenuous Life* (New York: The Century Company, 1900), 5.

¹⁰ David J. Silbey, *A War of Frontier and Empire: The Philippine-American War, 1899-1902* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2007), 33-36.

¹¹ Merritt to McKinley on May 13, 1898 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain Including the Insurrection in the Philippine Islands and the China Relief Expedition, April 15, 1898, to July 30, 1902, Volume 2* (Washington, DC: Center of Military History, 1993), 643.

and hold the capital. It seems more than probable that we will have the so-called insurgents to fight as well as the Spaniards, and upon the work to be accomplished will depend the ultimate strength and composition of the force.”¹²

Major General Nelson A. Miles, Commanding General of the United States Army, clarified the aim of American ground forces by highlighting the American intent to maintain the American flag on the Philippine Islands and defend the harbor at Manila Bay in order to free-up naval forces for potential duty elsewhere when he recommended to Secretary of War Russell Alexander Alger on May 16, 1898, that a modest force, primarily infantry and cavalry, be sent to the Philippines “...with a view to its maintaining our possession and our flag on the Philippine Islands, and at the same time relieve our navy as speedily as possible.” Nelson confirmed the Army’s limited mission to defend the harbor and contended that when the ground forces and accompanying artillery were in position, “the fleet can be released for more important service,” presumably, in this case, for defense of Hawaii or the American west coast.¹³

Major General Wesley Merritt’s words on May 17, 1898, however, reveal a premonition of the expanded mission forthcoming in the Philippine Islands when he declared, “I consider the composition of the force outlined by the Major-General Commanding the Army as unsuited to the ends to be accomplished, and insufficient in efficiency for the expedition to the Philippines...when the work to be done consists of conquering a territory 7,000 miles from our base, defended by a regularly trained and acclimated army of from 10,000 to 25,000 men, and inhabited by 14,000,000 of people, the majority of whom will regard us with the intense hatred born of race and religion.”¹⁴

Nonetheless, Merritt’s estimation of the Philippine army regulars was overstated in Miles’ estimation, and the approval for Merritt’s request for additional troops would be delayed for several days.

¹² Merritt to McKinley on May 15, 1898 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain, Volume 2*, 645.

¹³ Miles to Secretary of War on May 16, 1898 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain, Volume 2*, 647.

¹⁴ Merritt to Adjutant General on May 17, 1898 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain, Volume 2*, 648.

Miles, in his defense, believed that “the force ordered at this time is not expected to carry on a war to conquer an extensive territory, and the chief object...was to suggest a means of quickly establishing a strong garrison to command the harbor of Manila, and to relieve the United States fleet under Admiral Dewey with the least possible delay.”¹⁵ The Commanding General of the United States Army, however, was not privy to the internal debate over the disposition of the Philippine Islands that President McKinley was coping with.

In fact, a year later when a delegation of the General Missionary Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church visited President McKinley, he felt inclined to justify his decision regarding the Philippine Islands. It is thought that President McKinley was a deeply religious man and felt the necessity to demonstrate to the visiting church delegation that faith played a factor in his deliberations regarding the islands. So the President called out to the delegation members:

Hold a moment longer! Not quite yet, gentlemen! Before you go I would like to say just a word about the Philippine business.... The truth is I didn't want the Philippines, and when they came to us as a gift from the gods, I did not know what to do with them.... I sought counsel from all sides—Democrats as well as Republicans—but got little help. I thought first we would take only Manila; then Luzon; then other islands, perhaps, also. I walked the floor of the White House night after night until midnight; and I am not ashamed to tell you, gentlemen, that I went down on my knees and prayed Almighty God for light and guidance more than one night. And one night late it came to me this way - I don't know how it was, but it came: 1. That we could not give them back to Spain—that would be cowardly and dishonorable; 2. that we could not turn them over to France or Germany—our commercial rivals in the Orient—that would be bad business and discreditable; 3. that we could not leave them to themselves—they were unfit for self-government—and they would soon have anarchy and misrule over there worse than Spain's was; and 4. that there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God's grace do the very best we could by them, as our fellow men for whom Christ also died. And then I went to bed and went to sleep and slept soundly.¹⁶

So in the spring of 1898, honor, the economy, and the concepts of Manifest Destiny and White Man's Burden compelled President McKinley to declare the entire Philippines of strategic national

¹⁵ Miles to Secretary of War on May 18, 1898 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain*, Volume 2, 649.

¹⁶ Walter Millis, *The Martial Spirit - A Study of Our War with Spain* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1931), 383. For further information concerning McKinley's statements to the Methodist delegation see also Ephraim K. Smith, "William McKinley's Enduring Legacy: The Historiographical Debate on the Taking of the Philippine Islands," In *Crucible of Empire The Spanish-American War and Its Aftermath*, by James C. Bradford, 205-237 (Annapolis, Maryland: United States Naval Institute Press, 1993), 232-233.

importance to the United States. Despite some initial confusion between senior military and civilian leaders, the president's intent on May 19, 1898, seems clear when he provides the following guidance to Secretary of War R.A. Alger:

The destruction of the Spanish fleet at Manila, followed by the taking of the naval station at Cavite (the naval port of Luzon), the paroling of the garrisons, and acquisition of the control of the bay, have rendered it necessary, in the further prosecution of the measures adopted by this Government for the purpose of bringing about an honorable and durable peace with Spain, to send an army of occupation to the Philippines for the twofold purpose of completing the reduction of the Spanish power in that quarter and of giving order and security to the islands while in the possession of the United States...The first effect of the military occupation of the enemy's territory is the severance of the former political relations of the inhabitants and the establishment of a new political power. Under this changed condition of things the inhabitants, so long as they perform their duties, are entitled to security in their persons and property and in all their private rights and relations...It will therefore be the duty of the commander of the expedition, immediately upon his arrival in the islands, to publish a proclamation declaring that we come, not to make war upon the people of the Philippines nor upon any party or faction among them, but to protect them in their homes, in their employments, and in their personal and religious rights...Our occupation should be as free from severity as possible.¹⁷

In this message, President McKinley emphasized that the American military was in charge of the Philippines, but there was additional emphasis as well. The stress that President McKinley put on maintaining peaceful relations with the Philippine people as well as their individual rights and liberties cannot be missed. Additionally, in the same correspondence with the Secretary of War, the President endorsed the military's right to tax the Filipinos and expressed the desire to resume trade in the area for all neutral nations; this, of course, only reinforces the economic reasons for retaining the Philippine Islands. Major General Merritt's mission was expanded beyond its original scope as defined by the Commanding General of the United States Army and a troop increase followed the correspondence between the President and the Secretary of War as the Army began to mobilize more troops for Philippine service. Regardless, a clear strategy was set by President McKinley in 1898. Defining victory in the Philippines should be linked to the strategic policy objectives which President McKinley established. So ultimately, in defining victory in the Philippines, one must decide whether America achieved what it set out to do.

¹⁷ McKinley to Secretary of War on May 19, 1898 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain*, Volume 2, 676.

It seems clear that President McKinley's intent, indeed American intent at the beginning of the Philippine-American War, was to govern the Philippines, although exactly how long America was to preside over the inhabitants there was unspecified and left rather nebulous at the beginning of American involvement in the islands.¹⁸ There is some historical confusion regarding why President McKinley espoused noninterference and no "territorial aggression" on one hand and acted differently on the other.¹⁹ Regardless, there are in fact three strategic objectives that support President McKinley's policy objectives in the Philippines. Moreover, significant realization of these three strategic objectives allowed President Theodore Roosevelt to declare an American victory in the Philippines on July 4, 1902. First, the United States had to isolate or incorporate the modern-day Philippine monarch, leader, symbol, or head of the resisting army or guerilla force. Second, a government with a civilian, not military, face had to be emplaced. And third, some level of amnesty or reconciliation between the United States and the opposing forces had to occur. Individually, these events or efforts may not have created the effects necessary to produce a win in the eyes of the American people, but when combined, the effect produced a sense of victory.

Capturing the Philippine Kings

Major General Henry Clarke Corbin, the Adjutant General of the United States Army, received the message late on March 27, 1901. It was 11:50 pm when the news from Major General Arthur MacArthur, Jr. arrived: "General Funston has just returned from expedition to Palanan, province of Isabela, where he captured Aguinaldo, who is now in my possession at Malacanan. Particulars later."²⁰ The United States Army had been hunting the former American ally and current guerilla leader since the general insurrection began over two years prior and now, the army finally had Emilio Aguinaldo in custody.

¹⁸ Silbey, *A War of Frontier and Empire: The Philippine-American War, 1899-1902*, 95.

¹⁹ Ibid., 31.

²⁰ MacArthur to Adjutant General received March 27, 1901 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain, Volume 2*, 1262.

While reflecting upon the war and the importance of Aguinaldo's capture, General Frederick Funston, in his memoirs said, "...many of us had long felt that the thing could not end until he was either out of the way or a prisoner in our hands."²¹ The energy and effort applied to the military's hunt for Aguinaldo suggests the "capture the king and the war is over" type of mentality which existed in the minds of American servicemen and politicians at the time or to put it another way, capture Aguinaldo and the United States achieves victory.²² The hunt for the deposed Philippine President was long and the actual capture of General Aguinaldo was no meager feat. In addition to the standard guerilla modus operandi of rapidly transitioning between peaceful non-combatants and armed resisters, Aguinaldo used tactics that included the employment of fake names and disguises, coded messages to communicate with his subordinate insurgent commanders, and regular movement of his headquarters. Sometimes, even the inhabitants of the village or town where Aguinaldo stayed did not know that he was living there. Further complicating matters for Funston's plan to capture the insurgent leader was the location of the isolated village of Palanan where Aguinaldo's headquarters was established in early 1901.²³

Situated near the east coast and on the north end of the island of Luzon, Aguinaldo's agents could easily detect American forces moving either by land or sea approaches toward Palanan and therefore Aguinaldo had ample time to escape into the surrounding mountains and countryside once American forces were identified. The location of Palanan necessitated that General Funston, with the aid of some Macabebe Scouts and some handpicked officers, forge insurgent documents and don captured uniforms and equipment in order to gain access to Palanan disguised as a lightly armed guerilla force on a false mission to reinforce Aguinaldo's troops. General Funston personally consulted the department commander, General Loyd Wheaton, in Manila before executing his plan. The hazardous mission was

²¹ Frederick Funston, *Memories of Two Wars: Cuban and Philippine Experiences* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), 386.

²² Brian McAllister Linn, *Guardians of Empire: The US Army and the Pacific, 1902-1940* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 11.

²³ Funston, *Memories of Two Wars: Cuban and Philippine Experiences*, 384-393.

worth the risk to capture the important insurgent leader Emilio Aguinaldo and both General Wheaton and the division commander, General MacArthur, approved the operation. Following the successful capture of Aguinaldo, Funston personally delivered the once Philippine President to General MacArthur in Manila where the former guerilla was treated well. In recognition for successfully completing the heroic mission, Funston received word from Washington, DC that he had been awarded a commission in the regular army as a brigadier general. Additionally, Funston's officers received commissions in the regular army as well and the Macabebe Scouts were given various sums of money for their daring conduct.²⁴

The day after Aguinaldo's capture, Major General Arthur MacArthur, Jr. expressed high hopes that a "speedy cessation" of hostilities throughout the Philippine archipelago would follow.²⁵ There is no doubt that Aguinaldo was an important strategic target for the United States. Major General MacArthur received very specific instructions regarding the disposition of Aguinaldo, probably from President McKinley himself, relayed through the Adjutant General of the United States Army, Major General Henry Clarke Corbin, and MacArthur made no promises, proclamations, or deals with Aguinaldo without talking to Washington.²⁶ The reality, however, is that Aguinaldo's capture did not end the fighting in the Philippine Islands.

Part of the reason the fighting continued was the nearly immediate emergence of a second Philippine hero to command the guerilla forces. Miguel Malvar assumed command of the Philippine forces when Aguinaldo was captured in March of 1901 and led them until he was forced to surrender in the wake of General Bell's campaign in Southwestern Luzon on April 16, 1902.²⁷ General Miguel Malvar y Carpio was important enough in Filipino history for Representative Rodolfo Valencia of Oriental

²⁴ Funston, *Memories of Two Wars: Cuban and Philippine Experiences*, 391-426.

²⁵ MacArthur to Adjutant General received March 28, 1901 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain, Volume 2*, 1263.

²⁶ Corbin to MacArthur on March 29, 1901 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain, Volume 2*, 1263.

²⁷ Robert D. Ramsey, *A Masterpiece of Counter guerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902* (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2007), 14.

Mindoro to introduce a bill into the Philippine House of Representatives, in 2007, to correct the historical record and declare General Malvar the second Philippine President.²⁸ Although the bill is still, after over three years, “pending with the Committee on Basic Education and Culture” in the Philippine Congress, the fact that it was introduced at all lends weight to Malvar’s importance in the Philippine-American War.²⁹ Officially, the Philippine Government recognizes Emilio Aguinaldo as the first Philippine President serving from June 12, 1898, the officially recognized Philippine Independence Day, until his capture in 1901.³⁰ Interestingly, the Philippine record of Presidents does not resume until 1935 when Manuel L. Quezon became the second President of the Philippines and it is for this reason that Representative Valencia sought to declare General Malvar president.³¹

Brian McAllister Linn maintains the importance of Aguinaldo’s capture in *The Philippine War, 1899-1902*, stating that “Both MacArthur and the War Department trumpeted Aguinaldo’s capture as the ‘most important single military effect of the year,’ a coup that all but ended the war.”³² However, Linn reports that the evidence supports that a combination of factors led to the guerilla defeat, most notably the end of opposition on Panay and Mindanao and the surrender of the guerilla leader of Bulacan Province. Interestingly, in another example of American attempts to incorporate resistance leaders, insurgent General Isidoro Torres was eventually offered the governorship of Bulacan Province after he surrendered on April 24, 1901. Opting instead for isolation rather than incorporation into the American led governmental system; Torres refused the governorship and sailed to Singapore, and later Japan, before

²⁸ Maricel V. Cruz, "Lawmaker: History wrong on Gen. Malvar," *Manila Times*, January 2, 2008, http://web.archive.org/web/20080406082026/http://www.manilatimes.net/national/2008/jan/02/yehey/top_stories/20080102top6.html (accessed October 11, 2010).

²⁹ Rodolfo G. Valencia, "Specified House Bill HB02594," *House of Representatives Legislation Information System*, September 25, 2007, http://www.congress.gov.ph/legis/search/qry_show.php (accessed December 21, 2010).

³⁰ Diosdado Macapagal, "Proclamation No. 28 Declaring June 12 as Philippine Independence Day," *Philippine History Group of Los Angeles*, May 12, 1962, <http://www.bibingka.com/phg/documents/jun12.htm> (accessed December 21, 2010).

³¹ Cruz, "Lawmaker: History wrong on Gen. Malvar."

³² Brian McAllister Linn, *The Philippine War, 1899-1902* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000), 275-276.

returning to the Philippines in 1903.³³ Ultimately, Linn concludes that Aguinaldo's acceptance of American authority likely paved the way for other insurgent surrenders, but that those who were determined to rebel continued the fighting.³⁴

Civilian Government in the Philippines

In the middle of January 1899, the cabinet of President Aguinaldo's "de facto" government resigned as a whole.³⁵ Aguinaldo had been conducting negotiations with Brigadier General Elwell Stephen Otis in a vain attempt to strengthen his position and secure international recognition of the Philippine Government and its independence.³⁶ The Treaty of Paris, however, had been signed by representatives of the United States on December 10, 1898. President McKinley had instructed his representatives meeting with the Spanish in Paris to require American possession of Guam, Puerto Rico, and all of the Philippines, as part of the peace brokering to end the Spanish-American War.³⁷ As of mid-January, the document had not yet been ratified by the American Senate and Brigadier General Otis and Emilio Aguinaldo waited for the inevitable news that the United States had officially taken responsibility for the Philippine Islands. The Benevolent Assimilation Proclamation had been made at this point as well, and those Filipinos who desired an autonomous government knew that their prospect for a nation free of American influence was quickly slipping away.

Tensions were high along the picket-line surrounding Manila where hostilities between the Filipino and American armies would ultimately commence on February 4, 1899, and although Aguinaldo did not want to go to war with the United States, he found it increasingly difficult to "stem the dangerous

³³ Arnaldo Dumindin, "General Isidoro Torres Surrenders in Bulacan," *The Philippine-American War, 1899-1902*, 2006, <http://philippineamericanwar.webs.com/collapse1901.htm> (accessed March 16, 2011).

³⁴ Linn, *The Philippine War, 1899-1902*, 275-276.

³⁵ Otis to Adjutant General on January 12, 1899 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain*, Volume 2, 908.

³⁶ Linn, *The Philippine War, 1899-1902*, 36.

³⁷ Max Boot, *The Savage Wars of Peace* (New York: Basic Books, 2002), 105.

current of excitement” among his troops or the Filipino population.³⁸ President McKinley, who like Aguinaldo did not want to go to war, was determined to demonstrate America’s benevolent intentions. Therefore, before hostilities erupted between Aguinaldo’s men and American forces and before the United States Senate Ratified the Treaty of Paris, President McKinley dispatched the first Philippine Commission. Admiral Dewey and Brigadier General Otis were to join the three civilian commissioners led by Mr. Jacob G. Schurman. The commission arrived in the Philippines in late March 1899 after hostilities had commenced on February 4, however, President McKinley had dispatched the group with orders on January 20, “to facilitate the most humane, pacific, and effective extension of authority throughout these islands, and to secure, with the least possible delay, the benefits of a wise and generous protection of life and property to the inhabitants.”³⁹

At the time of his appointment to head the commission, Jacob Schurman was the President of Cornell University. He would be joined by two other civilian compatriots, retired colonel and Civil War veteran, Charles Denby who had previously served as Minister to China and Dean C. Worcester from the University of Michigan. Professor Worcester was considered an expert on the Philippines at the time having lived in the Philippines for years and “hunted with the wildest of the Moros and Sulus, attended their tribal rites, and studied the political economy of the islands.”⁴⁰

The commission’s purpose was to “study the commercial and social problems of the Philippines” to include evaluating the Filipino’s capacity for self-governance and taking stock of the island chain’s material resources and commercial opportunities. Schurman’s commission had no executive powers to act upon what it discovered, although Admiral Dewey and Brigadier General Otis could act within their previously established commands. It seems that President McKinley, in addition to sending the commission in order to quench America’s thirst for information about the Philippines, sought to

³⁸ Otis to Adjutant General on January 12, 1899 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain*, Volume 2, 909.

³⁹ Quoted in John Morgan Gates, *Schoolbooks and Krags* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1973), 80.

⁴⁰ "A Philippines Commission, President Schurman of Cornell Will Probably Be Chairman," *New York Times*, January 16, 1899, <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed December 23, 2010).

demonstrate the benevolent and peaceful intentions of the United States by sending civilians to interact with the Philippine people. General Aguinaldo and Brigadier General Otis' stalemated situation was believed to have been tenable long enough to allow the commission time to arrive in the Philippines. When Schurman arrived, however, he found out that fighting had erupted in Manila while the commission was underway.⁴¹

President McKinley appointed a second Philippine Commission in March 1900 to supervise the transfer of authority from the United States military to a civilian government.⁴² The reality was that the United States wanted to replace the military government in the Philippines with a civilian government as soon as possible, and the insurrection probably delayed the implementation of civilian authority.⁴³ American desire for civilian rule in the Philippines was undoubtedly advanced by the report from the first Philippine Commission. There were three relevant factors that stand out from the Schurman Commission's duty in the Philippine Islands.

First, the commission was convinced that the information and messages that the commission was propagating had a positive effect on the Filipinos. Despite the fact that Aguinaldo's men burned or destroyed notices published by the commission, Schurman promoted what appeared to be an honest agenda with an aim toward liberty and self-governance.⁴⁴ Second, the first Philippine Commission reported that the insurgency was not a national movement. The insurgents were using intimidation and fear tactics to control the local population and furthermore, the insurgency was problematic only in areas where armed Tagalogs had gathered in "considerable numbers." Additionally, in areas such as Bulacan Province in Central Luzon, insurgent attempts to raise money and recruits were proving unproductive and

⁴¹ "A Philippines Commission," *New York Times*.

⁴² Brian McAllister Linn, *The US Army and Counterinsurgency in the Philippine War, 1899-1902* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 20.

⁴³ Andrew J. Birtle, *US Army Counterinsurgency and Contingency Operations Doctrine 1860-1941* (Washington, DC: Center of Military History, 2004), 99.

⁴⁴ Gates, *Schoolbooks and Krags*, 81.

the Filipino population was requesting help from American forces to resist the insurgents.⁴⁵ Lastly, and most importantly, the Schurman Commission recommended that America implement civilian government in the Philippines as soon as possible. Although the First Philippine Commission acknowledged the Filipinos desire for independence and self-governance, they were adamant in their declaration that the Filipinos were not yet prepared to govern without American oversight. Despite that fact, Schurman's specific recommendations did include, however, that the United States establish a civilian government as quickly as possible to replace the existing military governorship. Additionally, the commission recommended the establishment of a bicameral legislature as well as independent governments on the provincial and municipal levels.⁴⁶

The establishment of civil government in the Philippines was quite controversial in the United States and the Schurman Commission's recommendations were far from universally popular. Some Americans, such as those in the Anti-Imperialist League, did not think that the United States should be committed in the Philippines at all, much less involved in the establishment of civil government.⁴⁷ Other pundits believed that moving too quickly to establish civil government was a mistake, and that America should be satisfied with the status quo of the established military government.⁴⁸ Nonetheless, President McKinley decided to appoint a second Philippine Commission in March 1900 to supervise the transfer of authority from the United States military to civilian government. And the commission would be led by future American president William H. Taft.⁴⁹

William Taft, who at the time of his appointment to head the commission was serving as the United States Judge of the Sixth Judicial Circuit, would not have an effortless transition to duty in the

⁴⁵ "Filipinos Unfit to Rule Themselves - So the Commission Reports to the President," *New York Times*, November 3, 1899, <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed December 23, 2010), 1-2.

⁴⁶ Ronald E. Dolan, "Philippines: A Country Study," *Country Studies*, 1991, <http://countrystudies.us/philippines/> (accessed December 27, 2010).

⁴⁷ Gates, *Schoolbooks and Krag's*, 31.

⁴⁸ "No Occasion For Haste," *New York Times*, February 5, 1900, <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed December 23, 2010).

⁴⁹ Linn, *The US Army and Counterinsurgency in the Philippine War, 1899-1902*, 20.

Philippines.⁵⁰ When Taft arrived in the Philippines on June 3, 1900, Brigadier General Arthur MacArthur, Jr. had succeeded Major General Otis as the Military Governor of the Philippines. MacArthur and Taft squabbled over military and civilian powers within the Philippines and fundamentally differed on the view of native Filipino collaboration. MacArthur believed that the Filipinos were predisposed to unity in the insurgency underway throughout the archipelago and Taft believed that the majority of the Philippine population supported the United States but that insurgent terror tactics kept the people under insurgent influence.⁵¹ Interestingly, it was Taft who initially recommended harsher tactics be used against the guerilla forces than what MacArthur actually employed, however, this changed after McKinley's reelection in December 1900.⁵² Ultimately, Taft judged the Army's success in the Philippines by the number of provinces it declared pacified and turned over to the Philippine Commission's control.⁵³

The Second Philippine Commission was comprised of five civilians, three of whom were lawyers and two academics, one of whom, Professor Worcester, had been a member of the First Philippine Commission. One of the lawyers, Luke E. Wright, was a Civil War veteran and all of the commission members were successful working professionals at the time of their appointments.⁵⁴ Prior to setting sail for Manila, William Taft and his fellow commissioners met with Secretary of State Elihu Root over a two-day period to outline the commission's duties in the Philippines. The Taft Commission would have much broader powers than the Schurman Commission. Their purpose was not only to observe, fact-find, and evaluate, but moreover to establish "local civil government throughout the islands."⁵⁵ At least one

⁵⁰ "Civil Government For the Filipinos," *New York Times*, February 7, 1900, <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed December 23, 2010).

⁵¹ Linn, *The Philippine War, 1899-1902*, 217.

⁵² Robert D. Ramsey, *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902* (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2007), 55.

⁵³ Linn, *The US Army and Counterinsurgency in the Philippine War, 1899-1902*, 20.

⁵⁴ Gates, *Schoolbooks and Kraggs*, 141.

⁵⁵ "Philippine Commission Will Have Much Broader Powers," *New York Times*, March 30, 1900, <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed December 22, 2010).

historian has called Secretary Root's instructions to the Taft Commission "the most important single document in American colonial history."⁵⁶

It is impossible to know precisely what President McKinley believed regarding the situation on the archipelago when he authorized the Second Philippine Commission; it has been noted that McKinley, as a strategic leader, "kept everything to himself."⁵⁷ It may be significant to note however that when the Taft Commissioners sailed for the Philippines, they took their families with them, and moreover, they were prepared for a two year mission.⁵⁸ President Roosevelt would of course, declare victory in the Philippines almost exactly two years after the Taft Commission landed in Manila Bay. It is certainly possible that President McKinley was encouraged to establish civilian government in the Islands by the report from Major General Otis that the war was essentially over or all but won.⁵⁹ In fact, in May of 1900, Major General Otis stated in an article in Leslie's Weekly news magazine:

You ask me to say when the war in the Philippines will be over and to set a limit to the men and treasure necessary to bring affairs to a satisfactory conclusion. That is impossible for the war in the Philippines is already over. The insurrection ended some months ago; and all we have to do now is to protect the Filipinos against themselves and to give protection to those natives who are begging for it.

There will be no more real fighting in the Philippines...of course the Islands must be thoroughly policed and it will take a good many men to do it...⁶⁰

But even though Otis claimed the war in the Philippines was over, his words underscored the threats that were still present in the Islands. William Taft understood the risks still involved with the American mission as well. Taft left his family in a much safer Japan during his initial voyage to the Philippines and made the following statement upon his June 3 arrival in Manila:

⁵⁶ Phillip Jessup quoted in Gates, *Schoolbooks and Krags*, 142.

⁵⁷ Matthew Moten, "Interview - Dr. Linn," *War Termination* (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2010), 143.

⁵⁸ "Philippine Commission Will Have Much Broader Powers," *New York Times*.

⁵⁹ Linn, *The Philippine War, 1899-1902*, 216.

⁶⁰ Quoted in William Thaddeus Sexton, *Soldiers in the Sun: An Adventure in Imperialism* (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1971), 237.

We are civil officers, men of peace. The field of our work is necessarily confined to regions where the armed enemy has ceased his operations. We cannot deal with armed men. Gen. MacArthur and the army will do that.

When those now in arms shall have laid them down, relying as they certainly can upon the justice, generosity, and clemency of the United States, we shall give them all a full hearing upon the policy to be pursued and the reforms to be initiated.⁶¹

For all practical purposes, the Taft Commission seemed to be a huge success. During its tenure it issued 499 laws. A Supreme Court and judicial system was established and a legal code was created to replace the existing and outdated Spanish laws. The Philippine municipal code that was established in 1901 established the procedures for popularly electing presidents, vice presidents, and councilors to serve on municipal boards. The municipal board members in turn elected provincial governors and were responsible for collecting taxes, maintaining public property, and carrying out construction projects.⁶²

Daniel R. Williams was the Private Secretary to Commissioner Bernard Moses, a member of the United States Philippine Commission, or the Second Philippine Commission, from March 16, 1900 to December 31, 1902. Mr. Williams also held the titles of Secretary Philippine Commission and Associate Judge Philippine Court of Land Registration, Manila while in performance of his duties abroad. Upon his return from Philippine service, Williams published a book titled *The Odyssey of the Philippine Commission* in which he recounted much of his Philippine experience. In the book, which was published in 1913, he stated, "Now, as then, one of our great parties is seeking to make an 'Issue' of the Philippines, and Filipino radicals are crying for independence with the same cheerful disregard of consequences that marked Mabini's appeal in 1900."⁶³ Although it should be noted that the resistance to Spanish and American authority did not fully overcome the ethnic, tribal, or social diversity in the Philippines or completely unite the guerilla fighters in their struggles against the American led Insular Government. Aguinaldo's government was drawn from the Filipino elite and many Filipino's were not represented. There were disputes between insurgent factions and as renowned Philippine-American War historian Dr.

⁶¹ Quoted in "The Philippine Commission Arrives at Manila on the Hancock - Judge Taft Makes a Statement," *New York Times*, June 4, 1900, <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed December 23, 2010).

⁶² Dolan, "Philippines: A Country Study."

⁶³ Daniel R. Williams, *The Odyssey of the Philippine Commission* (Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Co., 1913), 327.

Brian Linn notes, “These people aren’t fighting for a Philippines like Aguinaldo wants, a strong centralized government run by the Tagalogs. These people are Cebuano or Ilocano or Luzani. They want something like Brazil, a series of federated states...”⁶⁴

Reconciliation in the Philippine-American War

By late 1899, General Aguinaldo’s uniformed Army of Liberation of the Philippine Republic was all but beaten. The United States military had been conducting offensive operations and seizing key towns throughout the island of Luzon, as well as in other parts of the archipelago, almost since the fighting had begun in February and for the most part, American commanders uprooted Aguinaldo’s forces wherever they were concentrated in any substantial number.⁶⁵ Major General E.S. Otis’ forces had captured many key opposition force leaders and had Aguinaldo on the run. Otis reported the following battle update to Washington on November 24, 1899: “Claim to government by insurgents can be made no longer under any fiction; its treasurer, secretary of interior, and president of congress in our hands; its president and remaining cabinet officers in hiding, evidently in different central Luzon provinces; its generals and troops in small bands scattered through these provinces, acting as banditti, or dispersed, playing the role of amigos with arms concealed...”⁶⁶

For Major General Otis, who would relinquish command the following spring to Brigadier General MacArthur on May 5, 1900, the war was coming to a close.⁶⁷ His disdain for the remaining numbers of the Army of Liberation of the Philippine Republic and the indications that Aguinaldo’s soldiers were defeated was exemplified in the report from Otis to Major General Henry Clarke Corbin, the Adjutant General of the United States Army, on November 27, 1899: “Aguinaldo has collected more than 1,000 of his troops at the north; probably most will desert him. Number small detachments insurgent

⁶⁴ Moten, "Interview with Dr. Linn," *War Termination*, 139-158.

⁶⁵ Linn, *The Philippine War, 1899-1902*, 139-159.

⁶⁶ Otis to Adjutant General received November 24, 1899 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain*, Volume 2, 1107.

⁶⁷ Gates, *Schoolbooks and Kraggs*, 143.

troops throughout country north of Manila have been captured and inhabitants manifest gratitude for deliverance. Indications are that insurgent force south of Manila disintegrating and troops going to their homes.”⁶⁸

For Emilio Aguinaldo, however, the war was just beginning. With the total defeat of his uniformed army, Aguinaldo reverted to the same strategy he employed against the occupying Spanish in 1897 when it was no longer possible for his forces to conduct conventional operations; he shifted to guerrilla warfare.⁶⁹ On November 12, 1899, General Aguinaldo held a war council at Bayambang in Central Luzon to officially disband the Army of Liberation, designate districts of operation for his commanders, and outline the tactics to be employed in the guerilla war which lay ahead. It has been noted that the purpose of Aguinaldo’s guerilla war was not necessarily to win the war but rather, to prolong the war and “wear the Americans down, relying on disease, terrain, and frustration to demoralize the soldiers.”⁷⁰

Less than one month after assuming command from Major General Otis, Brigadier General MacArthur, with William Taft’s concurrence, cultivated a new element of American strategy in the Philippines. On June 5, 1900, MacArthur recommended the following to his superiors in Washington, DC: “Propose immediate issue of amnesty offering complete immunity for past and liberty for future to all who have not violated laws of war and who will renounce insurrection and accept sovereignty and authority of the United States...” President McKinley approved the proposal the following day and stipulated that the proclamation be at his direction.⁷¹

The published amnesty decree included amnesty for guerilla leader Emilio Aguinaldo and was relatively flexible. The wording of the proclamation avoided absolutisms and stipulated that money be

⁶⁸ Otis to Adjutant General received November 27, 1899 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain, Volume 2*, 1109.

⁶⁹ Ramsey, *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902*, 7.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 23-24.

⁷¹ MacArthur to Adjutant General received June 5, 1900 and Corbin to MacArthur on June 6, 1900 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain, Volume 2*, 1175.

paid for weapons that were turned over to American forces. MacArthur believed that an amnesty offering would expedite the pacification process in the Philippines, but it is difficult to demonstrate the offering's success, at least initially.⁷² When the amnesty proclamation was first published, it was supposed to expire on September 21, 1900, ninety days after it was issued. After the first ninety days, however, only 5,022 insurrectos had surrendered and MacArthur was starting to doubt the proclamation's effectiveness.⁷³ There would be two factors which would contribute to the amnesty proclamation's success however, first, the re-election of President McKinley in November 1900 and second, the capture of Emilio Aguinaldo and his subsequent acceptance of American authority.

As MacArthur pondered the "meager result of amnesty" he considered the implication of captured documents containing evidence that suggested that guerilla leaders were making concerted efforts to hold their units together until after the American Presidential Election. The information in MacArthur's possession suggested that if President McKinley was reelected, then there would be numerous insurgent surrenders.⁷⁴ Teodoro Sandico, who had been a cabinet secretary in President Aguinaldo's government and was currently a guerilla leader, had written a proclamation in June of 1900 that claimed that the war had created such political strife in the United States that McKinley may be defeated in his Presidential bid.⁷⁵ Furthermore, Sandico had called for further resistance and stated that the Filipinos should accept nothing short of independence.⁷⁶ At the end of August however, MacArthur had captured a document from Sandico that stated that the Philippines required peace even if liberty was sacrificed to achieve it. Additionally, Sandico's paper confirmed that if McKinley was reelected, then he would surrender to American forces. MacArthur therefore decided to recommend to the American

⁷² MacArthur to Adjutant General received June 9, 1900 and Corbin to MacArthur on June 15, 1900 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain, Volume 2*, 1177-1179.

⁷³ Ramsey, *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902*, 50.

⁷⁴ MacArthur to Adjutant General received August 31, 1900 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain*, 1203.

⁷⁵ "The Hong Kong Junta," *National Historical Commission of the Philippines*, <http://www.nhi.gov.ph/> (accessed December 31, 2010).

⁷⁶ Gates, *Schoolbooks and Krags*, 162-163.

leadership in Washington that nothing was said regarding the official expiration date of the amnesty proclamation and thereby leave the future of the amnesty policy in an indeterminate state.⁷⁷

Many insurgents, who had hoped that anti-imperialist William Jennings Bryan would become president and that the United States Congress would recognize Philippine independence, were disappointed and demoralized when McKinley was reelected.⁷⁸ After the election, in early December, 2,180 insurrectos surrendered in the First District at Santa Cruz in Ilocos Sur province alone.⁷⁹ Teodoro Sandico, who sounded bold in his June 1900 proclamation, surrendered to Brigadier General Frederick Funston in April of 1901.⁸⁰

In addition to the reelection of McKinley and Aguinaldo's capture by Funston in March, Aguinaldo's appeal for peace and his acceptance of American authority increased the number of surrenders.⁸¹ The United States Army demonstrated its tactical supremacy by capturing Aguinaldo, but MacArthur waited for the guerilla leader to reconcile himself to defeat as MacArthur stated at the end of March shortly after Funston's mission: "As result of conference now in progress, probable Aguinaldo will issue address advising general surrender, delivery arms, acceptance American supremacy."⁸² Aguinaldo would not keep MacArthur waiting too long.

When Aguinaldo was brought to Manila he met with Cayetano Arellano, who was a member of Aguinaldo's government until 1899, and had since been appointed the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Philippines by the Taft Commission.⁸³ During this time, MacArthur, in addition to requesting

⁷⁷ MacArthur to Adjutant General received August 31, 1900 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain, Volume 2*, 1203.

⁷⁸ Linn, *The Philippine War, 1899-1902*, 171 and 187.

⁷⁹ Ramsey, *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902*, 53.

⁸⁰ Linn, *The US Army and Counterinsurgency in the Philippine War, 1899-1902*, 75.

⁸¹ Ramsey, *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902*, 63.

⁸² MacArthur to Adjutant General received March 28, 1901 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain, Volume 2*, 1263.

⁸³ Gates, *Schoolbooks and Krags*, 85. See also "Cayetano L. Arellano," *National Historical Commission of the Philippines*, <http://www.nhi.gov.ph/> (accessed December 31, 2010).

authority to renew the amnesty notice that had quietly and officially expired, sent the following to Adjutant General Corbin: “Since arrival Manila Aguinaldo...investigating conditions archipelago, has relied almost entirely upon advice Chief Justice Arellano...Proposes to address armed insurgents, advising surrender, delivery arms, acceptance American sovereignty. Has reached conclusion voluntarily, without semblance coercion or promises...He is satisfied people demand peace: believes interest of country need it, and has apparently sacrificed his own view for the benefit of the archipelago.”⁸⁴

Aguinaldo’s proclamation was issued toward the end of April 1901.⁸⁵ Emilio Aguinaldo was not happy with his fate, but he did not believe that the Filipino people were weak for accepting American authority. Moreover, he believed that he was doing the right thing for his country. Aguinaldo stated, “By acknowledging and accepting the sovereignty of the United States throughout the entire archipelago, as I now do without any reservation whatsoever, I believe that I am serving thee, my beloved country. May happiness be thine.”⁸⁶ MacArthur had high hopes that the document would have a significant impact on the war. He reported in April just before Aguinaldo’s proclamation was issued that, “Its immediate publication simultaneously with amnesty proposed by me—April 6—would, in my opinion, almost instantly terminate hostilities throughout archipelago, insure delivery of several thousand guns still held by insurgents, and establish peace under conditions most favorable to immediate organization and permanent maintenance of stable civil government.”⁸⁷

After McKinley’s reelection and Aguinaldo’s acceptance of American authority, insurgents began surrendering in increasing numbers throughout the Philippines. Surrenders increased to 900 in January, 750 in February, 7,000 in March, over 6,000 in April, and were between 1,000 and 2,000 through July.

⁸⁴ MacArthur to Adjutant General received April 1, 1901 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain*, Volume 2, 1265.

⁸⁵ Gates, *Schoolbooks and Krags*, 235.

⁸⁶ Emilio Aguinaldo quoted in MacArthur to Adjutant General received April 10, 1901 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain*, Volume 2, 1268.

⁸⁷ MacArthur to Adjutant General received April 10, 1901 in *Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain*, Volume 2, 1268.

The number of weapons turned over to American forces and the number of important surrendering guerilla leaders increased as well and the number of armed engagements between the Army and the insurrectos decreased. During MacArthur's command in the Philippines a total of 23,095 guerilla fighters either surrendered or were listed as missing in action.⁸⁸

Ultimately, it may be impossible to determine exactly how many insurgents laid down their arms because of the amnesty proclamation alone. Yet, it is unthinkable that the gesture of good will went unnoticed in the hearts and minds of the Filipino people and therefore it seems to be a key component of the American strategy that brought the war to a close. If amnesty had not been an option for the insurgents, the numbers of surrendering guerillas may not have been as high as they turned out to be after McKinley's reelection and Aguinaldo's capture. Furthermore, it seems plausible that Aguinaldo may not have reconciled himself to defeat or accepted American authority at all if he suspected that the majority of his soldiers would face imprisonment or death.

Resolving Matters in the Philippine-American War

Despite the fact that some groups, most notably the Moros on the island of Mindanao, continued to engage American forces and resist the established government in the Philippines beyond 1902, the American claim to victory is based on the achievement of three important objectives that for all intents and purposes brought the Philippine-American War to a close. First, the army captured and incorporated highly visible and essential insurrecto leaders like Aguinaldo and captured and isolated others such as Malvar. Second, the Taft Commission established a perpetuating civilian government which incorporated elected members of the Filipino society who were recognized by the United States and the international community. And third, some key guerilla generals like Emilio Aguinaldo submitted to American authority and reconciled themselves to defeat—or at least decided to discontinue armed resistance—due in part to the willingness of the United States to provide a measure of amnesty. America achieved enough

⁸⁸ Ramsey, *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902*, 63-64.

in the Philippine-American War to declare victory in 1902. Now one must consider how the achievement of the three key strategic factors identified in the Philippine-American War relate to the war in Iraq.

Setting the Stage for the War in Iraq

Like America's involvement in the Philippines, America's 2003 war in Iraq was controversial almost from the start. Unlike the Philippine-American War, however, much of the controversy surrounding the Iraq War involved not imperialist expansionism, but in part oil and chiefly weapons of mass destruction. On Friday, October 11, 2002, the United States Senate voted 77 to 23 and the United States House of Representatives voted 296 to 133 to authorize President George W. Bush to attack Iraq if Saddam Hussein's regime did not comply with the United Nations resolutions to give up weapons of mass destruction.⁸⁹

The tension over weapons of mass destruction had played itself out in a game between Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq and the United Nations over a period of over ten years, beginning almost immediately following the 1991 Gulf War. The first major move made by Saddam was to officially end cooperation with the UN Special Commission designated to oversee the destruction of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. In 1999, Iraq rejected UN Security Council Resolution 1284 which created the monitoring, verification, and inspection commission to replace the UN Security Commission previously held responsible for inspection duties in Iraq. Then in November 2002, after the American war resolution was passed by the House and the Senate, the UN weapons inspectors returned to Iraq armed with a new resolution which was accompanied by "serious consequences" if Iraq was found in breach of the terms.⁹⁰

Adding fuel to the Iraq war resolution fire was a newly heightened American consciousness regarding terror attacks and tactics following the September 11, 2001 tragedy. There was an increasing fear among some Americans that a regime such as Saddam Hussein's would sell or provide a weapon of

⁸⁹ "Senate Approves Iraq War Resolution," *CNN*, October 11, 2002, http://articles.cnn.com/2002-10-11/politics/iraq.us_1_biological-weapons-weapons-inspectors-iraq?_s=PM:ALLPOLITICS (accessed February 6, 2011).

⁹⁰ "Iraq Timeline," *BBC News*, January 8, 2011, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/737483.stm (accessed February 6, 2011).

mass destruction to a terrorist group such as Al Qaeda. A leading Republican Senator and former prisoner of war John McCain reflected the opinion of many Americans when he said, regarding the weapons of mass destruction inspection stand-off between the United Nations and Iraq, "The consequences of inaction could be far more dire than the consequences of this action."⁹¹

UN chief weapons inspector Hans Blix reported in early March 2003 that Iraq had accelerated its cooperation but that his inspectors needed more time to verify Iraq's compliance.⁹² But Saddam Hussein's time as leader of the rogue nation was growing shorter by the day. Based on information from British intelligence, President Bush believed that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction. After the fact, the CIA discovered that the information regarding the weapons of mass destruction was not true.⁹³ However, on March 17, 2003, the President gave Saddam Hussein and his sons forty-eight hours to leave Iraq or accept war with the United States.⁹⁴

Ultimately, regardless of the existence of weapons of mass destruction, there was precedence establishing that Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq was a threat to America. During the 1991 Gulf War, Saddam's Baath Party government sent professional two-man teams to attack targets within the United States. The CIA had most of the Iraqi agents arrested or deported however, the event demonstrated the Iraqi government's desire and willingness to conduct terror operations within America. Additionally, Iraqi intelligence attempted to assassinate President George H.W. Bush during his April 1993 visit to Kuwait, and earlier that year, after Ramzi Yousef bombed the World Trade Center, one of Yousef's co-conspirators flew to Baghdad.⁹⁵ Saddam Hussein's failure to comply and cooperate with the United Nations was just one more example in a long list of evidence that the dictator was a danger to America.

⁹¹ Jerry Coffee, "The Popular Myths About Iraq," *Midweek* (December 3, 2003): 22.

⁹² "Iraq Timeline," *BBC News*.

⁹³ Coffee, "The Popular Myths About Iraq," 22.

⁹⁴ "Iraq Timeline," *BBC News*.

⁹⁵ Steven Coll, *Ghost Wars* (New York: Penguin Press, 2004), 252.

Protests against an invasion of Iraq had begun in September 2002 before the fighting started and reached a peak on February 13, 2003, when millions of people in more than 800 cities around the world marched to demonstrate their opposition to the impending war. The Guinness Book of World Records even confirmed Rome, Italy as the site of the largest anti-war rally in history.⁹⁶ The public however was not privy to the intelligence, even if inaccurate, that America's leaders possessed and many people were unsure why there seemed to be a push to go to war with Iraq given the recent inspection results by Hans Blix and his team of weapons inspectors. There were many worldwide who wondered why the United States was unwilling to give the inspectors more time to conduct an investigation of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction stockpiles.⁹⁷ Although that did not seem to be the only confusion regarding the beginning of the Iraq War. When combat began, there existed a unique view on the type of warfare that was being waged in Iraq as reflected in the news reporting on comments made by Secretary of State Colin Powell in March of 2003:

After all, this is a different kind of war. The objective is not simply an enemy's defeat. The Bush administration hopes to defeat Saddam while still winning over the Iraqi people. "All I know is that the liberation of Iraq is underway," proclaimed Secretary of State Colin Powell, "and we want to do it in a way that will demonstrate to the world that we come as liberators." Over the past few weeks, Franks and the cadre of generals helping him manage the war have been refining a detailed list of "no-strike targets," including hospitals, schools, mosques, water-processing plants, and historical sites. Minimizing destruction will, they hope, pay dividends in popular support for American troops in Iraq and in assuaging opposition to the war.⁹⁸

Like the Philippine-American War, there was a sense of duty and obligation in the Iraq War that extended beyond purely American material interests and encompassed the idealistic; something more than simply defeat of the enemy's army and conquering territory existed from the start. Iraq, like the Philippine archipelago, is not homogenous and there are different religious, ethnic, and tribal groups throughout the country. When Saddam's regime was toppled by the American led invasion, the different groups within

⁹⁶ "Global Anti-Iraq War Protests," *MSN News*, November 12, 2009, <http://news.in.msn.com/gallery.aspx?cp-documentid=3482033&page=2> (accessed February 8, 2011).

⁹⁷ Patrick E. Tyler, "Threats and Responses: News Analysis; A New Power In the Streets," *New York Times*, February 17, 2003, <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed February 8, 2011).

⁹⁸ Mark Mazzetti and Kevin Whitelaw, "On the Road to Baghdad," *US News and World Report* (March 31, 2003): 13-20.

Iraq began competing for power.⁹⁹ Coalition forces soon found themselves fighting in an environment characterized by guerilla-style warfare tactics of which they were usually the targets of, but sometimes only bystanders as competing groups waged war on one another. By the end of 2005, America produced a document which encompassed specific goals for operations in Iraq.

In November 2005, the National Security Council published America's *National Strategy for Victory in Iraq*. The thirty-five page document defined victory in Iraq in the following stages:

Short term, Iraq is making steady progress in fighting terrorists, meeting political milestones, building democratic institutions, and standing up security forces.

Medium term, Iraq is in the lead defeating terrorists and providing its own security, with a fully constitutional government in place, and on its way to achieving its economic potential.

Longer term, Iraq is peaceful, united, stable, and secure, well integrated into the international community, and a full partner in the global war on terrorism.¹⁰⁰

Although the crafters of the *National Strategy for Victory in Iraq* chose to use the phrase "Our Strategy for Victory is Clear" as a sub-heading within the document instead of clearly stating the words "policy objectives," the following sentence constitutes the United States Government's policy objective for Iraq: "We will help the Iraqi people build a new Iraq with a constitutional, representative government that respects civil rights and has security forces sufficient to maintain domestic order and keep Iraq from becoming a safe haven for terrorists."¹⁰¹ Furthermore, the writers of the *National Strategy for Victory in Iraq*, identified three "broad tracks"—political, security, and economic—which constituted strategic objectives for American involvement in Iraq. Not only did the strategic objectives for Iraq closely resemble the objectives identified for the Philippine-American War, but a lot of what had already been accomplished in Iraq coincided with similar achievements in turn of the century Philippines.

Capturing the Iraqi Kings

It could be argued that Saddam Hussein was the equivalent of an Iraqi King and the equivalent of Emilio Aguinaldo in the Philippines—not as a dictator or almost any sort of personal and professional

⁹⁹ "Iraq Timeline," *BBC News*.

¹⁰⁰ National Security Council, *National Strategy for Victory in Iraq* (Washington, DC, 2005), 1.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid*.

likeness—but rather as a source of inspiration and leadership for those resisting American forces. Later in the war, the leader who provided the source of inspiration for the guerilla movement was Abu Musab al-Zarqawi and there were others who took up the mantle after his death. The point here is that in all cases where a high-profile leader emerged, just as in the Philippine-American war, America sought to isolate or incorporate the enemy leader and was successful. Al Qaeda in Iraq boss Abu Musab al-Zarqawi and Shi'a religious frontrunner Muqtada al-Sadr are examples of religiously opposed leaders in Iraq, however, the source of power they provide their unconventional warfare followers and their influence on America's claim to victory are, for as much as it concerns this examination, identical.

Saddam Hussein was the strategic target from the beginning of America's operations in Iraq. At the time of the invasion, the dictator's face graced numerous magazine covers and newspapers across the United States. As one magazine indicated, "Hopes were high that American forces would be able to track down and kill Saddam in the early stages of the conflict."¹⁰² Although some optimists may have believed that Saddam Hussein's capture would determine absolute victory for America, other opinions were more realistic about the effect of the dictator's capture:

For once, the media have got it right. The capture of Saddam Hussein is a major event in the war. Its importance does not rest on whether he was in operational command of the guerrillas; he wasn't. Nor does it hinge on whether his capture will destroy the morale of the guerrillas; it won't. The importance of Hussein's capture is that it happened at all: It signals a major improvement in US war-fighting capabilities in general and in American intelligence in particular.¹⁰³

The acknowledgement that the guerilla's resistance would continue should not undervalue the importance of Saddam's capture. In addition to the proficiency the operation demonstrated regarding American intelligence and combat forces, the symbolic nature of Saddam's capture as the deposed Iraqi leader is important as well. As reporter Peter Grier noted, "As long as he remained at large, the silent majority of Iraqis might find it hard to believe that he would not wait out the US and return. Whether he

¹⁰² Douglas Pasternak and Kevin Whitelaw, "Getting Personal," *US News and World Report* (March 31, 2003): 28-29.

¹⁰³ "Saddam Hussein and the Dollar War," *STRATFOR Global Intelligence*, December 18, 2003, http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/saddam_hussein_and_dollar_war (accessed February 10, 2011).

was involved in directing the insurgent resistance to the US or not, he was a symbol rallying their efforts.”¹⁰⁴

Abu Musab al-Zarqawi's death in an airstrike two and a half years after Saddam Hussein's capture was of immense importance to coalition efforts in Iraq as well. Zarqawi was first introduced to attentive American news watchers before the invasion of Iraq on February 5, 2003, when Secretary of State Colin Powell addressed the United Nations Security Council. Ultimately, the information regarding Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program provided by Colin Powell to the UN became somewhat controversial. It was not established that there was a clear link between Al Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden and the Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein; however, it was identified by Colin Powell that Al Qaeda lieutenant Abu Musab al-Zarqawi was operating in Iraq.¹⁰⁵

By the time he was killed by American forces near the city of Baqubah, north of Baghdad, Al Qaeda in Iraq leader Abu Musab al-Zarqawi had masterminded hundreds of bombings, kidnappings and beheadings, some of which were recorded and broadcast over television and the internet. He had become famous throughout the United States and throughout the world, undoubtedly inspiring thousands of extremists to join the fight against coalition forces and encouraging guerillas in Iraq to continue fighting. Interestingly, when this enemy leader met his demise, President Bush “echoed Iraqi and American military leaders in cautioning that Zarqawi's death would not in itself halt the bloodshed in Iraq.”¹⁰⁶

The saga of a third “Iraqi king” needs to be considered in the establishment of American victory over guerilla forces in Iraq. Muqtada al-Sadr was a member of one of Iraq's most renowned religious families, descended from the house of the Prophet Muhammad, and a son of the assassinated Ayatollah

¹⁰⁴ Peter Grier, "Anatomy of Hussein's Capture," *The Christian Science Monitor*, December 15, 2003, <http://www.csmonitor.com/2003/1215/p01s01-woiq.html> (accessed February 10, 2011).

¹⁰⁵ Colin Powell, "US Secretary of State Colin Powell Addresses the U.N. Security Council," *The White House*, February 5, 2003, <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/02/20030205-1.html> (accessed February 11, 2011).

¹⁰⁶ Ellen Knickmeyer and Jonathan Finer, "Insurgent Leader Al-Zarqawi Killed in Iraq," *The Washington Post*, June 8, 2006, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/06/08/AR2006060800114.html> (accessed February 10, 2011).

Muhammad Sadiq al-Sadr, who was one of the most important leaders in the Hawza, the center of Shi'ite religious seminaries and scholarship.¹⁰⁷ Sadr, who was never fully integrated with Saddam Hussein's regime and was more than likely repressed by it, rejected the American presence in Iraq and the American appointed Governing Council almost immediately, and in July 2003, announced his plans to form a militia.¹⁰⁸ Sadr created his militia primarily to defend his political institutions and religious interests principally centered around the Shia holy cities of Karbala, Najaf, and Kufa.¹⁰⁹

Sadr's militia, the Imam al-Mahdi Army, or as it is more commonly known, Jaysh al-Mahdi, began violently resisting coalition forces in earnest around April 2004. Sadr's anti-American and anti-government rhetoric prompted the Coalition Provisional Authority to shut down Sadr's newspaper, al-Hawza, and an Iraqi judge issued an arrest warrant for Sadr based on his alleged connection to the murder of fellow Shia cleric Abd Al-Majid al-Khoei. Sadr's response to these perceived transgressions was a call for armed resistance by his followers.¹¹⁰

Muqtada al-Sadr's goals remained stable throughout the Iraq War. Sadr wanted the United States out of Iraq and believed that no legitimate democratic process could occur while America maintained a presence on Iraqi soil. If foreign troops had to remain in Iraq, Sadr wanted them under United Nations command. He favored a strong central government with a strong military, but one free of Baathist influence. It seemed that Sadr wanted an Islamic Iraqi system very similar to Iran's government; however, he desired a rise in Iraqi Shiism which would be free and independent from Iranian influence.¹¹¹ These goals were not incompatible with American or Iraqi government interests and ultimately, albeit

¹⁰⁷ Nimrod Raphaeli, "Understanding Muqtada al-Sadr." *The Middle East Quarterly* (Fall 2004): 33-42.

¹⁰⁸ John Pike, "Muqtada al-Sadr," *Global Security*, November 30, 2006, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/iraq/al-sadr.htm> (accessed February 10, 2011).

¹⁰⁹ Marisa Cochrane, *The Fragmentation of the Sadrist Movement* (Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of War, 2009), 14.

¹¹⁰ Donald P. Wright and Timothy R. Reese, *On Point II: Transition to the New Campaign* (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2008), 39.

¹¹¹ Juan Cole, "What Does Muqtada Al-Sadr Want?" *Counter Currents*, August 20, 2004, <http://www.countercurrents.org/iraq-cole200804.htm> (accessed February 13, 2011).

after Sadr's militia suffered severe casualties at the hands of coalition forces, a cease fire was brokered between Sadr's militia and coalition forces. After a second round of clashes between Jaysh al-Mahdi and coalition forces, which began almost inadvertently when militiamen feared that United States Marines were on their way to arrest Muqtada al-Sadr, a second truce was enacted and Sadr's militia began to fracture.¹¹²

Interestingly, Muqtada al-Sadr's desire to participate in the political process in Iraq may have been motivation for division within his militia. There were two significant happenings during the time period from 2005 to 2007 that should be noted. First, it seems that many of Sadr's subordinate militia commanders turned toward criminalized, mafia-style tactics where they were no longer just interested in simply defending Shia holy sites or fighting for representation in the Iraqi government process. In fact, in addition to extortion, bribery, and more typical forms of criminal activity, some militiamen, spurred by not all that uncommon attacks by Sunni extremists on Shia pilgrims and mosques, waged a violent religious struggle which included ethnic and religious cleansing.¹¹³ Second, some factions within Sadr's militia began to receive weapons, the most deadly of which included explosively-formed penetrators, and training from the Iranian Qods Force with the help of Arabic-speaking Lebanese Hezbollah commanders.¹¹⁴

It is not exactly clear to what extent Muqtada al-Sadr was explicitly or implicitly involved in the more serious attacks during the 2005 to 2007 period which included improvised explosive device attacks on coalition forces using explosively-formed penetrators obtained from Iran and the indiscriminate killing of Sunni Iraqis. What is more clear, is that Sadr's failure to control the radical activities of Shia militias in Iraq resulted in a decision by Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki to target Sadr's supporters and allow combat operations within the Shia militia stronghold of Sadr City, formerly Saddam City, a district in the Iraqi

¹¹² Cochrane, *The Fragmentation of the Sadrism Movement*, 14.

¹¹³ Sabrina Tavernise, "Cleric Said to Lose Reins of Parts of Iraqi Militia," *New York Times*, September 28, 2006, <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed February 13, 2011).

¹¹⁴ Cochrane, *The Fragmentation of the Sadrism Movement*, 18-19, 21.

capital of Baghdad. Maliki's decision resulted in a planned security operation in Baghdad named Fardh al-Qanoon, or Enforcing the Law, which began in early 2007 and was aimed at decreasing the level of violence in the capital city due to Shia militia operations.¹¹⁵

Regardless of the power that Muqtada al-Sadr wielded over the Shia militias that were violently clashing with American and Iraqi forces, Sadr was the inspirational leader who unified the political, religious, and military interests for many of those who opposed the existing Iraqi government and the presence of American forces in Iraq. Although Muqtada al-Sadr was not in actuality captured by American or Iraqi forces, the crackdown on Shia militias in what would become known as the Surge period for American forces, drove Sadr from the Iraqi battlefield and further marginalized the effectiveness of the "Iraqi King's" denial of American goals in Iraq; this would not, however, be Muqtada al-Sadr's greatest role in America's claim to victory.

Civilian Government in Iraq

United States Army Field Manual 3-24, *Counterinsurgency*, states that, "The primary objective of any COIN operation is to foster development of effective governance by a legitimate government."¹¹⁶ American intentions in Iraq were never to conquer or to rule. The United States national strategy called for Iraq to become a stable member of the international community and American leaders hoped that the new, post-Saddam Iraq would be life-long ally, but not an American puppet. With this in mind, and in a pattern similar to the establishment of civilian governance in the Philippines, when the high-intensity fighting stopped, the American military and civilian leadership went forward almost immediately with efforts to establish an Iraqi government.

It has been noted that Saddam Hussein's totalitarian rule suppressed the Iraqi people's political expression in pre-war Iraq. Moreover, Saddam's dictatorship not only eroded Iraq's "civic infrastructure"

¹¹⁵ Cochrane, *The Fragmentation of the Sadrist Movement*, 22.

¹¹⁶ *FM 3-24 Counterinsurgency* (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2006), 1-21.

but the “physical infrastructure” of Iraq as well.¹¹⁷ The key point to note here is the link between the government, the people, and the country’s infrastructure. This draw attention to the fact that American efforts to improve the average Iraqi citizen’s standard of living were geared to the ultimate aim of garnering support for a civilian government and to gain buy-in from the Iraqi citizenry in the democratic process.

When Iraqis voted for the first time in history in the 2005 general elections, an estimated seventy-five percent of the 19 million eligible Iraqi general public cast their ballot. Although that number fell to an estimated sixty-two percent in the 2010 general elections, it should be noted that the United States voter turnout in for the 2008 presidential election was approximately sixty-two percent and hovered at a meager forty percent for the 2010 United States general elections.¹¹⁸ Clearly, the majority of the Iraqi population had bought-in to the idea of voting for their country’s leadership.

Voter turnout is only one consideration with regard to the establishment of a civilian government in Iraq. Ironically, after the January 2005 elections, the citizens of Iraq had not voted for the type of secular government that many American officials hoped for. The newly elected Iraqi government was in fact religiously based and had strong ties to neighboring Iran.¹¹⁹ Ultimately however, the 2005 election may have worked to America’s advantage. As some scholars have pointed out, “Iraq’s democracy has for some time now proven itself independent from the US.”¹²⁰ Additionally, Iraq’s democracy has proven that it is somewhat independent from its powerful Shite neighbor Iran as well.

¹¹⁷ Wright and Reese, *On Point II: Transition to the New Campaign*, 402.

¹¹⁸ "Iraq Election Turnout 62%, Officials Say," *BBC News*. March 9, 2010, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8556065.stm> (accessed February 20, 2011) and Michael McDonald, *The United States Elections Project*, January 28, 2011, <http://elections.gmu.edu/index.html> (accessed February 20, 2011).

¹¹⁹ Robin Wright, "Iraq Winners Allied With Iran Are the Opposite of US Vision," *The Washington Post*, February 14, 2005, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A21679-2005Feb13.html> (accessed February 20, 2011).

¹²⁰ Victor Davis Hanson, "So What Happened to Iraq?" *National Review Online*, April 15, 2010, <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/229544/so-what-happened-iraq/victor-davis-hanson> (accessed February 21, 2011).

In the March 2010 general elections, the predominately Sunni Arab-supported “Iraqiyya” ballot led by former coalition appointed interim Iraqi Prime Minister Iyad al-Allawi unexpectedly gained a preponderance of votes in a very close election. Although the post-election politics were characterized by deadlock and infighting among the Iraqi political parties, American intervention enabled the parties to come to an agreement and develop an outline for their newly elected government. Moreover, the inclusion of Allawi’s party in key positions in the government indicated that Iran did not complete its ultimate design for the 2010 elections. Some American officials believe that Iran influenced Shite political factions within Iraq in order to ensure that pro-Iranian Shites would lead the Iraqi government following the elections.¹²¹ An independent Iraqi government supported by the majority of the Iraqi electorate is a significant victory for America.

Reconciliation in the Iraq War

Just as in the Philippine-American War, “Iraqi Kings” played prominently in reconciliation. The designation of an interim Iraqi government and the installation of Iyad al-Allawi as interim Iraqi Prime Minister by the American led coalition in 2004 created turmoil among factions vying for power in Iraq. The Iraqis—already coping with natural tensions created by tribal, ethnic, and religious differences—now had to cope with the additional tension created by some leaders such as Muqtada al-Sadr, who indirectly labeled the government as an illegitimate American puppet.¹²² Iraqi political differences would continue for years, as evidenced by the deadlock following the 2010 general elections—although some would undoubtedly argue that the debate was a sign of a healthy democracy. Breakthroughs in the diplomatic process did occur, however, in order to facilitate the reconciliation and healing process in Iraq, and in some important instances, an “Iraqi King,” such as Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, contributed to the reconciliation process—albeit in his case, unwillingly.

¹²¹ Kenneth Katzman, *Iraq: Politics, Elections, and Benchmarks*, CRS Report for Congress (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, 2011), i.

¹²² Wright and Reese, *On Point II: Transition to the New Campaign*, 43, 99-102, 156-183.

In 2006, when Abu Musab al-Zarqawi was killed, the United States Ambassador to Iraq Zalmay Khalilzad called on Iraqis to end the sectarian violence and unite behind Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki's new government. After the successful 2005 elections, the government had taken months to come together and had struggled to agree on nominees for key ministerial positions. Amazingly, only minutes after Zarqawi's death was announced, the key posts of interior minister, defense minister, and national security adviser were filled by an Iraqi parliament arguably prepared to begin the reconciliation process. Both Shia and Sunni Arabs were called upon to fill the remaining key ministerial positions.¹²³

Unlike al-Zarqawi, Muqtada al-Sadr would not contribute to the reconciliation process through death, but rather by attempting to increase his political power and work within the Iraqi governmental system. On August 7, 2004, interim Iraqi Prime Minister Iyad al-Allawi signed a limited amnesty law that pardoned insurgents who had committed minor crimes. Moreover, Allawi made a peace overture to al-Sadr and made it possible for the cleric to take part in the political process. Allawi stated, "I have been having positive messages from Muqtada al-Sadr...We invite, and I invite from this platform, Moqtada al-Sadr to participate in the elections next year."¹²⁴ It took nearly a year for al-Sadr to accept Allawi's peace offering, but in August 2005 Muqtada al-Sadr called for a nationwide cease-fire and announced that he would join the political process.¹²⁵ Unfortunately, al-Sadr's militia had begun to splinter by this point and the Sadrist movement's political, religious, and military wings were deeply divided in their priorities and loyalties. The Sadrists formed the Promised Day Brigade in order to peacefully further their political aims, but some factions like Asaib Ahl al-Haq, rejected Muqtada al-Sadr's call to disarm and urged al-Sadr to retract his statements and return to armed resistance.¹²⁶ Ultimately, Muqtada al-Sadr and many of his followers were incorporated into the Iraqi governmental system. These Sadrists, by becoming willing

¹²³ Knickmeyer and Finer, "Insurgent Leader Al-Zarqawi Killed in Iraq."

¹²⁴ John Pike, "Muqtada al-Sadr," *Global Security*, November 30, 2006, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/iraq/al-sadr.htm> (accessed February 10, 2011).

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Cochrane, *The Fragmentation of the Sadrist Movement*, 40-44.

participants in the governmental process and opting to discontinue armed resistance, helped pave the road toward concluding the war in Iraq.

There were other types of reconciliation that occurred during the Iraq War as well, the Anbar Awakening, for example, when—as former serviceman and author John McCary states, “The sheikhs’ assessment of the U.S. military changed from that of an occupying power to a supporting one...”¹²⁷ Arguably, the Anbar Awakening helped bridge the gap between not only Sunni Arabs and Americans, but Sunni Arabs and the majority Shia Iraqi population as well. Additionally, as a final example, the Sons of Iraq movement, which spawned from the Anbar Awakening and spread throughout the country as they obtained security contracts with coalition forces, exemplified a portion of the population that was reconciled to work within the existing governmental framework.¹²⁸

Resolving Matters in Iraq

In Iraq, America applied a historically-tested formula that brought the war to a successful conclusion. The United States incorporated or isolated leaders such as al-Zarqawi and Saddam Hussein who were essential to their fighters’ armed resistance of coalition forces. Additionally, a civilian government, supported by the majority of the Iraqi citizenry, was successfully created and provided representation for Iraq in the international community. Moreover, America and the newly formed Iraqi Government implemented a well-received reconciliation program which included a degree of amnesty and was supported by the incorporation of leaders such as al-Sadr. Together, the achievement of these three objectives created a strong base to ultimately support America’s stated goal in Iraq to create a democratic, united, and stable partner in the international community.

¹²⁷ John A. McCary, "The Anbar Awakening: An Alliance of Incentives," *The Washington Quarterly*, 32 (January 2009): 43-59.

¹²⁸ Greg Bruno, "The Role of the 'Sons of Iraq' in Improving Security," *The Washington Post*, April 28, 2008, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/04/28/AR2008042801120.html> (accessed March 15, 2011).

Conclusion

The Philippine-American War, like the war in Iraq, was complicated from the beginning. Moreover, neither the war—even after America declared victory—nor the involvement of the United States in the Philippines, was universally well-received, as reflected by the remarks by James Henderson Blount, who served in the Philippines as an Officer in the United States Volunteers from 1899 to 1901 and as a United States District Judge in the Philippines from 1901 to 1905. Blount, who published a book on the Philippines in 1912 said, “We should stop running a kindergarten for adults in Asia, and get back to the Monroe Doctrine. There are only two hemispheres to a sphere, and our manifest destiny lies in the Western one.”¹²⁹ Blount’s powerful words regarding America’s involvement overseas nearly become irrelevant, however, when considering the statement of Elihu Root who in August 1916 said, “The question whether it was wise or unwise for the United States to take title to the Philippines and assume the burden of government there no longer calls for consideration. We did take the Philippines.”¹³⁰

Furthermore, the ultimate aims for both Iraq and the Philippines were not dissimilar. Regarding the ultimate disposition of the Philippine Islands, former Philippine Commission member Charles Burke Elliot said, “America hopes that a prosperous tropical dependency will in the course of time grow into a free state through the development of the capacity of the people for self-government.”¹³¹ America’s hope for Iraq, as reflected in the *National Strategy for Victory in Iraq* document published in 2005 was that the country emerged “peaceful, united, stable, and secure, well integrated into the international community, and a full partner in the global war on terrorism.”¹³² So in the final analysis, *how* America became involved in Iraq and the Philippines is not as important as the result of the struggle in both countries. More importantly, America can claim victory in both wars.

¹²⁹ James Henderson Blount, *The American Occupation of the Philippines, 1898-1912* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1912), 654.

¹³⁰ Quoted in Charles Burke Elliott, *The Philippines to the End of the Military Regime: America Overseas* (Indianapolis, IN: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1916), Prefatory Note.

¹³¹ Elliott, *The Philippines to the End of the Military Regime: America Overseas*, 4.

¹³² National Security Council, *National Strategy for Victory in Iraq*, 1.

The results of the Philippine-American War suggest that the achievement of three strategic objectives in Iraq contribute greatly to America's claim to victory. In both conflicts, America isolated or incorporated the modern-day monarch, leader, symbol, or head of the resisting army or guerilla force, and established a legitimate civilian government in order to govern the country as well as represent it in the international community. Additionally, there occurred a level of reconciliation between the United States and its opposing forces and in both cases this was characterized by a degree of amnesty. When combined, these events or efforts seemed to produce the effects necessary to declare victory. Moreover, the three achievements identified were linked to the overall strategic objective in both wars which was to create a stable and self-governing member of the international community.

It should be noted, as it was previously stated in this monograph, that armed conflict in the Philippines did not end with the declaration of victory in 1902, just as the fighting in Iraq among factions there continues today. The presence of American troops and armed exchanges does not negate a stake to the claim of victory in war. In reality, the United States has military forces conducting operations in support of smaller scale conflicts in many parts of the world today, to include the Philippines and other countries. Victory does not necessarily equate to an absolute withdrawal of military forces. One should consider this fact when evaluating the conclusion of the war in Iraq and the inevitable conclusion of the war in Afghanistan. The three factors identified in this monograph may not be an absolute tool for evaluating victory in wars that are characterized by guerilla style tactics or insurgency, but they are a proven historical guidepost for gauging America's claim to victory in complex warfare.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Books and Original Documents

- Blount, James Henderson. *The American Occupation of the Philippines, 1898-1912*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.
- Correspondence Relating to the War With Spain Including the Insurrection in the Philippine Islands and the China Relief Expedition, April 15, 1898, to July 30, 1902, Volume 2*. Washington, DC: Center of Military History, 1993.
- Elliott, Charles Burke. *The Philippines to the End of the Military Regime: America Overseas*. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1916.
- Funston, Frederick. *Memories of Two Wars: Cuban and Philippine Experiences*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2009.
- National Security Council. *National Strategy for Victory in Iraq*. Washington, DC, 2005.
- Roosevelt, Theodore. *The Strenuous Life*. New York: The Century Company, 1900.
- Williams, Daniel R. *The Odyssey of the Philippine Commission*. Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Co., 1913.

Internet

- "A Philippines Commission, President Schurman of Cornell Will Probably Be Chairman." *New York Times*. January 16, 1899. <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed December 23, 2010).
- "Civil Government For the Filipinos." *New York Times*. February 7, 1900. <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed December 23, 2010).
- "Filipinos Unfit to Rule Themselves - So the Commission Reports to the President." *New York Times*. November 3, 1899. <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed December 23, 2010).
- Germany's Surrender in WWII and Related Media*. <http://www.history.com/audio/germanys-surrender-in-wwii#germanys-surrender-in-wwii> (accessed 10 26, 2010).
- Grier, Peter. "Anatomy of Hussein's Capture." *The Christian Science Monitor*. December 15, 2003. <http://www.csmonitor.com/2003/1215/p01s01-woiq.html> (accessed February 10, 2011).
- Knickmeyer, Ellen, and Jonathan Finer. "Insurgent Leader Al-Zarqawi Killed in Iraq." *The Washington Post*. June 8, 2006. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/06/08/AR2006060800114.html> (accessed February 10, 2011).
- "No Occassion For Haste." *New York Times*. February 5, 1900. <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed December 23, 2010).
- "Philippine Commission Will Have Much Broader Powers." *New York Times*. March 30, 1900. <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed December 22, 2010).

Powell, Colin. "US Secretary of State Colin Powell Addresses the U.N. Security Council." *The White House*. February 5, 2003. <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/02/20030205-1.html> (accessed February 11, 2011).

Roosevelt, Theodore. "Proclamation 483 - Granting Pardon and Amnesty to Participants in Insurrection in the Philippines." *The American Presidency Project*. July 4, 1902. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu> (accessed November 24, 2010).

"Senate Approves Iraq War Resolution." *CNN*. October 11, 2002. http://articles.cnn.com/2002-10-11/politics/iraq.us_1_biological-weapons-weapons-inspectors-iraq?_s=PM:ALLPOLITICS (accessed February 6, 2011).

"The Philippine Commission Arrives at Manila on the Hancock - Judge Taft Makes a Statement." *New York Times*. June 4, 1900. <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed December 23, 2010).

Valencia, Rodolfo G. "Specified House Bill HB02594." *House of Representatives Legislation Information System*. September 25, 2007. http://www.congress.gov.ph/legis/search/qry_show.php (accessed December 21, 2010).

Articles

Bullard, Robert L. "Military Pacification." *Journal of the Military Service Institution of the United States*, 1910: 1-24.

Mazzetti, Mark, and Kevin Whitelaw. "On the Road to Baghdad." *US News and World Report*, March 31, 2003: 13-20.

Pasternak, Douglas, and Kevin Whitelaw. "Getting Personal." *US News and World Report*, March 31, 2003: 28-29.

Secondary Sources

Books

Arnold, James R. *Jungle of Snakes*. New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2009.

Atkinson, Rick. *Crusade - The Untold Story of the Persian Gulf War*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1993.

Ball, Michael A. *Defining Success in the War on Terrorism*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: School of Advanced Military Studies, 2004.

Birtle, Andrew J. *US Army Counterinsurgency and Contingency Operations Doctrine 1860-1941*. Washington, DC: Center of Military History, 2004.

Boot, Max. *The Savage Wars of Peace*. New York: Basic Books, 2002.

Brinkley, Douglas. *The Wilderness Warrior - Theodore Roosevelt and the Crusade For America*. New York: Harper Collins, 2009.

- Coats, Stephen D. *Gathering at the Golden Gate: Mobilizing for War in the Philippines, 1898*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2006.
- Coll, Steven. *Ghost Wars*. New York: Penguin Press, 2004.
- Cosmas, Graham A. *An Army for Empire: The United States Army in the Spanish-American War*. Texas A&M University Press, 1998.
- Dictionary of American Biography*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.
- Dolman, Everett C. *Pure Strategy: Power and Principle in the Space and Information Age*. New York: Frank Cass, 2005.
- Gates, John Morgan. *Schoolbooks and Krags*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1973.
- Ikle, Fred Charles. *Every War Must End*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.
- Kaplan, Robert D. *Imperial Grunts*. New York: Random House, 2005.
- Karnow, Stanley. *In Our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines*. Ballantine Books, 1990.
- Linn, Brian McAllister. *Guardians of Empire: The US Army and the Pacific, 1902-1940*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- . *The Philippine War, 1899-1902*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000.
- . *The US Army and Counterinsurgency in the Philippine War, 1899-1902*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Millett, Richard L. *Searching for Stability: The US Development of Constabulary Forces in Latin America and the Philippines*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2010.
- Millis, Walter. *The Martial Spirit - A Study of Our War with Spain*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1931.
- Ramsey, Robert D. *A Masterpiece of Counterinsurgency Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2007.
- . *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2007.
- Sexton, William Thaddeus. *Soldiers in the Sun: An Adventure in Imperialism*. Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1971.
- Silbey, David J. *A War of Frontier and Empire: The Philippine-American War, 1899-1902*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2007.
- Smith, Ephraim K. "William McKinley's Enduring Legacy: The Historiographical Debate on the Taking of the Philippine Islands." In *Crucible of Empire The Spanish-American War and Its Aftermath*, by James C. Bradford, 205-237. Annapolis, Maryland: United States Naval Institute Press, 1993.

Turabian, Kate L. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*. 7th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Wright, Donald P, and Timothy R Reese. *On Point II: Transition to the New Campaign*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2008.

Internet

Banusiewicz, John D. "Gates Seeks Expansion of US-Vietnamese Cooperation." *US Department of Defense News*. October 11, 2010. <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=61217> (accessed October 19, 2010).

Blake, John. "Past War Offers Afghanistan Lessons - And It's Not Vietnam." *CNN*. January 7, 2011. <http://afghanistan.blogs.cnn.com/2010/01/07/past-war-offers-afghanistan-lessons-and-its-not-vietnam/> (accessed January 30, 2011).

Bruno, Greg. "The Role of the 'Sons of Iraq' in Improving Security." *The Washington Post*. April 28, 2008. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/04/28/AR2008042801120.html> (accessed March 15, 2011).

"Cayetano L. Arellano." *National Historical Commission of the Philippines*. <http://www.nhi.gov.ph/> (accessed December 31, 2010).

Cole, Juan. "What Does Muqtada Al-Sadr Want?" *Counter Currents*. August 20, 2004. <http://www.countercurrents.org/iraq-cole200804.htm> (accessed February 13, 2011).

Cruz, Maricel V. "Lawmaker: History wrong on Gen. Malvar." *Manila Times*. January 2, 2008. http://web.archive.org/web/20080406082026/http://www.manilatimes.net/national/2008/jan/02/yehey/top_stories/20080102top6.html (accessed October 11, 2010).

Dolan, Ronald E. "Philippines: A Country Study." *Country Studies*. 1991. <http://countrystudies.us/philippines/> (accessed December 27, 2010).

Dumindin, Arnaldo. "General Isidoro Torres Surrenders in Bulacan." *The Philippine-American War, 1899-1902*. 2006. <http://philippineamericanwar.webs.com/collapse1901.htm> (accessed March 16, 2011).

"Global Anti-Iraq War Protests." *MSN News*. November 12, 2009. <http://news.in.msn.com/gallery.aspx?cp-documentid=3482033&page=2> (accessed February 8, 2011).

Hanson, Victor Davis. "So What Happened to Iraq?" *National Review Online*. April 15, 2010. <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/229544/so-what-happened-iraq/victor-davis-hanson> (accessed February 21, 2011).

"Iraq Election Turnout 62%, Officials Say." *BBC News*. March 9, 2010. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8556065.stm> (accessed February 20, 2011).

"Iraq Timeline." *BBC News*. January 8, 2011. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/737483.stm (accessed February 6, 2011).

- Macapagal, Diosdado. "Proclamation No. 28 Declaring June 12 as Philippine Independence Day." *Philippine History Group of Los Angeles*. May 12, 1962.
<http://www.bibingka.com/phg/documents/jun12.htm> (accessed December 21, 2010).
- McDonald, Michael. *The United States Elections Project*. January 28, 2011.
<http://elections.gmu.edu/index.html> (accessed February 20, 2011).
- "Philippines." *Nation Master*. 2007. <http://www.nationmaster.com> (accessed October 19, 2010).
- Pike, John. "Muqtada al-Sadr." *Global Security*. November 30, 2006.
<http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/iraq/al-sadr.htm> (accessed February 10, 2011).
- "Saddam Hussein and the Dollar War." *STRATFOR Global Intelligence*. December 18, 2003.
http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/saddam_hussein_and_dollar_war (accessed February 10, 2011).
- "Senate Approves Iraq War Resolution." *CNN*. October 11, 2002. http://articles.cnn.com/2002-10-11/politics/iraq.us_1_biological-weapons-weapons-inspectors-iraq?_s=PM:ALLPOLITICS
 (accessed February 6, 2011).
- Spanish American War Chronology*. <http://www.spanamwar.com> (accessed October 30, 2010).
- Tavernise, Sabrina. "Cleric Said to Lose Reins of Parts of Iraqi Militia." *New York Times*. September 28, 2006. <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed February 13, 2011).
- "The Hong Kong Junta." *National Historical Commission of the Philippines*. December 31, 2010.
<http://www.nhi.gov.ph/> (accessed December 31, 2010).
- Tyler, Patrick E. "Threats and Responses: News Analysis; A New Power In the Streets." *New York Times*. February 17, 2003. <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed February 8, 2011).
- Wright, Robin. "Iraq Winners Allied With Iran Are the Opposite of US Vision." *The Washington Post*. February 14, 2005. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A21679-2005Feb13.html>
 (accessed February 20, 2011).

Articles

- Bartholomees, J. Boone. "Theory of Victory." *Parameters*, Summer 2008: 25-36.
- Coffee, Jerry. "The Popular Myths About Iraq." *Midweek*, December 3, 2003: 22.
- McCary, John A. "The Anbar Awakening: An Alliance of Incentives." *The Washington Quarterly*, January 2009: 43-59.
- Raphaeli, Nimrod. "Understanding Muqtada al-Sadr." *The Middle East Quarterly*, Fall 2004: 33-42.

Additional Research Material

Monographs, Government Reports and Theses

- Bruscino, Thomas A. "'Its Officers Did Not Forget': The Philippine War, the Press, and the Pre-World War I US Army." *The US Army and the Media in Wartime: Historical Perspectives*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2009. 49-62.
- Byler, Charles A. "Leonard Wood, John J. Pershing, and Pacifying the Moros in the Philippines: Americans in a Muslim Land." *Turning Victory Into Success Military Operations After the Campaign*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2004. 89-104.
- Cochrane, Marisa. *The Fragmentation of the Sadrist Movement*. Iraq Report, Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of War, 2009.
- Garner, Jay M. "Iraq Revisited." *Turning Victory Into Success: Military Operations After the Campaign*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2004. 253-280.
- Jones, Douglas D. *Understanding Measures of Effectiveness in Counterinsurgency Operations*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: School of Advanced Military Studies, 2006.
- Katzman, Kenneth. *Iraq: Politics, Elections, and Benchmarks*. CRS Report for Congress, Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, 2011.
- Moos, Felix. "Terrorism Revisited." *Turning Victory Into Success: Military Operations After the Campaign*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2004. 207-215.
- Moten, Matthew. "Interview - Dr. Linn." *War Termination*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2010. 139-158.
- Moten, Matthew. "Interview - Dr. Roger Spiller." *War Termination*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2010. 17-29.

US Army Field Manuals

- FM 1-02 Operational Terms and Graphics*. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2004.
- FM 2-0 Intelligence*. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2010.
- FM 3-0 Operations*. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2001.
- FM 3-0 Operations*. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2008.
- FM 3-24 Counterinsurgency*. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2006.
- FM 3-24.2 Tactics in Counterinsurgency*. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2009.
- FM 90-8 Counterguerilla Operations*. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1986.